# General Inflammation Testing

**Origination Date: 06/16/2026**
**Last Review: 09/28/2026**
**Update Notification: 10/01/2026**
**Effective Date: 01/01/2027**

***Important Note About This Policy***

*Oscar's reimbursement policies serve as a guide to assist providers with accurate claims submission and outline the basis for reimbursement if the service is a covered benefit. Coverage does not guarantee reimbursement; services must meet authorization and medical necessity guidelines for the procedure, diagnosis, and member's state of residence.*

*Our policies provide general reference for described services and do not cover every aspect of reimbursement. Other factors may supplement, modify, or supersede this policy, including legislative mandates, provider contracts, member benefit documents, and/or other reimbursement, medical, or drug policies. Unless otherwise noted within the policy, our reimbursement policies apply to both participating and non-participating professional providers and facilities.*

*Providers are responsible for submission of accurate documentation of services performed. Claims should be coded appropriately according to industry standard coding guidelines including, but not limited to: Uniform Billing Editor, American Medical Association, Current Procedural Terminology, CPT® Assistant, Healthcare Common Procedure Coding System, ICD-10 CM and PCS, National Drug Codes, Diagnosis Related Group guidelines, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services National Correct Coding Initiative Policy Manual, CCI table edits and other CMS guidelines. If appropriate coding/billing guidelines or current reimbursement policies are not followed, we may deny the claim and/or recoup claim payment.*

*Oscar routinely updates reimbursement policies, and new versions are published on this website. If you print a copy of this policy, please be aware that the policy may be updated later. Oscar communicates policy updates to providers via update notifications.*

Policy Description | Related Policies | Indications and/or Limitations of Coverage | Table of Terminology | Scientific Background | Guidelines and Recommendations | Applicable State and Federal Regulations | Applicable CPT/HCPCS Procedure Codes | Evidence-based Scientific References

## I. Policy Description

Inflammatory response can occur due to tissue injury and/or various disorders, including arthritis, lupus, and infection. Acute phase reactants, such as serum C-reactive protein (CRP), are released in the acute phase response during inflammation and can be used to monitor inflammation. Inflammation may also be measured using the simple laboratory technique of erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR).[1]

For guidance on the use of CRP as a cardiac biomarker, please see policy AHS-G2150-Biomarkers for Myocardial Infarction and Chronic Heart Failure. For guidance on the use of CRP as a marker for acute pancreatitis, please see AHS-G2153-Pancreatic Enzyme Testing for Acute Pancreatitis.

## II. Related Policies

| Policy Number | Policy Title |
|---|---|
| AHS-G2150 | Biomarkers for Myocardial Infarction and Chronic Heart Failure |

| AHS-G2153 | Pancreatic Enzyme Testing for Acute Pancreatitis |
|---|---|

## III. Indications and/or Limitations of Coverage

Application of criteria is dependent upon an individual's benefit coverage at the time of the request. Specifications pertaining to Medicare and Medicaid can be found in the "Applicable State and Federal Regulations" section of this policy document.

1) Measurement of C-reactive protein (CRP) and/or erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) **MEETS CRITERIA** for the conditions specified in Note 1.

2) For individuals without a diagnosed or suspected inflammatory condition (see Note 1), measurement of ESR **DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA**.

3) Measurement of CRP and/or ESR during general exam without abnormal findings **DOES NOT MEET CRITERIA**.

---

**NOTES:**

Note 1: The applicable inflammatory marker testing criteria are determined by the diagnosed or suspected inflammatory condition. Depending on the condition, the test may be C-reactive protein (CRP), erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), either CRP or ESR, or both CRP and ESR. Either conventional CRP or high-sensitivity CRP may be used to measure CRP levels. When either CRP or ESR meets criteria, CRP is the preferred biomarker. If CRP and ESR are ordered at the same time for a condition where only CRP or ESR meets criteria, only CRP meets criteria.

| Condition | Test(s) That Meet Criteria | Frequency of Testing |
|---|---|---|
| **Acute and Chronic Urticaria** | CRP or ESR | Not specified (NS) |
| **Acute Hematogenous Osteomyelitis (AHO)** | CRP | To confirm diagnosis; 2-3 days during the early therapeutic course; weekly until normalization (or a clear trend toward normalization is evident) |
| **Acute Phase Inflammation** | CRP | NS |
| **Ankylosing Spondylitis** | CRP or ESR | Regular interval use in patients with active symptoms |
| **Arthritis** | CRP and ESR | 1-3 months initially; 6-12 months later |
| **Castleman's Disease** | CRP | NS |
| **General Inflammation** | CRP | NS |
| **Hodgkin Lymphoma** | ESR | Every 3-6 months for 1-2 years; every 6-12 months for the next 3 years; annually thereafter |
| **Irritable Bowel Syndrome** | CRP and ESR | During initial assessment to exclude other diagnoses (e.g., inflammatory bowel disease) |
| **Large Vessel Vasculitis (Giant Cell Arteritis, Takayasu Arteritis)** | CRP and ESR | To confirm diagnosis; every 1–3 months during the first year; every 3–6 months thereafter |
| **Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children (MIS-C)** | CRP | To establish diagnosis |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Nonradiographic Axial Spondyloarthritis** | CRP or ESR | Regular interval use in patients with active symptoms |
| **Pediatric Chronic Nonbacterial Osteomyletis (CNO)** | CRP and ESR | To confirm diagnosis for individuals meeting **all** of the entry criteria (see Note 2) |
| **Periprosthetic Joint Infections (PJI)** | CRP and ESR | NS |
| **Polymyalgia Rheumatica** | CRP or ESR | At initial diagnosis; every 3 months during long-term steroid therapy |
| **Rheumatoid Arthritis** | CRP or ESR | Prior to treatment; every 1-3 months during active disease; annually when disease is inactive |
| **Systemic Lupus Erythematosus** | CRP or ESR | At initial assessment; every 1-3 months during active disease; every 6-12 months during stable disease; during pregnancy |
| **T-Cell Lymphomas** | CRP and ESR | NS |

**Note 2:** Entry criteria for CNO:[2]

- Bone pain and/or musculoskeletal functional limitation for six or more weeks
- Onset before 18 years of age
- Abnormal radiograph or advanced imaging (MRI, CT, bone scintigraphy at nonarthritic bone sites) findings

## IV. Table of Terminology

| Term | Definition |
|---|---|
| AAAAI | Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology |
| AAFP | American Academy of Family Physicians |
| AAOS | American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons |
| AAOS | American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons |
| ABIM | American Board of Internal Medicine |
| ABVD | Adriamycin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine |
| ACAAI | American College of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology |
| aCL | Anticardiolipin |
| ACPA | Anti-cyclic citrullinated peptide antibodies |
| ACR | American College of Rheumatology |
| ACR | American College of Radiology |
| ANA | Antinuclear antibodies |
| Anti-CCP | Anti-cyclic citrullinated peptides |
| Anti-dsDNA | Anti-double stranded DNA |
| Anti-β2-GPI | Anti-β2-glycoprotein I |
| aPL | Antiphospholipid antibodies |
| AS | Ankylosing spondylitis |
| ASCP | American Society for Clinical Pathology |
| ASCP | Anti-cyclic citrullinated peptide antibodies |
| AUC | Area under the curve |

| | |
|---|---|
| BHPR | British Health Professionals in Rheumatology |
| BSR | British Society for Rheumatology |
| CBC | Complete blood count |
| cCRP | Cardiac C-reactive protein |
| CDAI | Clinical disease activity index |
| CHL | Classic Hodgkin lymphoma |
| CLIA | Clinical laboratory improvement act |
| CRA | Canadian Rheumatology Association |
| CRP | C-reactive protein |
| CTD | Connective tissue diseases |
| CVD | Cardiovascular disease |
| DAS | Disease activity score |
| DAS28 | 28-Joint disease activity score |
| DAS28-CRP | Disease activity score 28 C-reactive protein |
| DAS28-ESR | Disease activity score with 28-joint counts - erythrocyte sedimentation rate |
| EDL | Essential In Vitro Diagnostics |
| EDTA | Ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid |
| eGFR | Estimated glomerular filtration rate |
| EIA | Enzyme immunoassay |
| ENA | Extractable nuclear antigens |
| ESR | Erythrocyte sedimentation rate |
| EULAR | European League Against Rheumatism |
| FDA | Food and Drug Administration |
| GCA | Giant cell arteritis |
| HCSC | Health care service corporation |
| HL | Hodgkin Lymphoma |
| hsCRP | High-sensitivity C-reactive protein |
| IBD | Inflammatory bowel disease |
| IBS | Irritable bowel syndrome |
| ICSH | International Council for Standardization in Hematology |
| ISRT | Involved-site radiation therapy |
| IVD | In vitro diagnostics |
| JTFPP | Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters |
| LAC | Lupus anticoagulant |
| LDH | Lactate dehydrogenase |
| MCD | Multicentric Castleman Disease |
| MSIS | Musculoskeletal Infection Society |
| NA | Not applicable |
| NASH | Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis |
| NCCN | National Comprehensive Cancer Network |
| NICE | National Institute for Health and Care Excellence |

| | |
|---|---|
| NPV | Negative predictive value |
| NS | Not specified |
| NSAID | Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs |
| PAS | Patient activity scale |
| PJI | Periprosthetic joint infections |
| PMR | Polymyalgia rheumatica |
| PPV | Positive predictive value |
| RA | Rheumatoid arthritis |
| RACGP | Rheumatoid Arthritis Working Group of The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners |
| RAPID3 | Routine assessment of patient index data 3 |
| RD | Rheumatic disease |
| RDT | Rapid diagnostic test |
| RF | Rheumatoid factor |
| SAA | Spondylitis Association of America |
| SDAI | Simplified disease activity index |
| SIRS | Systemic inflammatory response syndrome |
| SLE | Systemic lupus erythematosus |
| TSH | Thyroid-stimulating hormone |
| VASDA | Visual analog scale disease activity |
| VASQOL | Vascular access-specific quality of life |
| WHO | World Health Organization |

## V. Scientific Background

*Conditions Associated with Acute Inflammatory Responses*

Diseases most associated with an acute inflammatory response measured by CRP and/or ESR include arthritis, especially rheumatoid arthritis (RA), polymyalgia rheumatica (PMR), giant cell arteritis (GCA), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), cardiovascular disease (CVD),[1] and Hodgkin Lymphoma (HL).[3] RA is a systemic polyarthritis that can lead to joint loss as well as tendon and ligament deformation to the point of affecting day-to-day living. The diagnosis of RA can be made in a patient "with inflammatory arthritis involving three or more joints, positive RF [rheumatoid factor] and/or anti-citrullinated peptide/protein antibody, disease duration of more than six weeks, and elevated CRP or ESR, but without evidence of diseases with similar clinical features."[4] PMR "is an inflammatory rheumatic condition characterized clinically by aching and morning stiffness in the shoulders, hip girdle, and neck."[5] PMR is frequently associated with GCA (also known as Horton disease), which is vasculitis of medium-to-large blood vessels and can include the aorta and cranial arteries. Cranial arteritis can lead to permanent vision loss. An estimated 40-50% of patients with GCA also suffer from PMR whereas 15% of all PMR patients are also diagnosed with GCA. Due to inflammation of the aorta and aortic branches, aortic aneurysm and aortic dissection can occur in patients with GCA.[6] In both PMR and GCA, ESR and CRP levels are typically elevated. SLE "is a complex autoimmune disease with chronic relapsing-remitting course and variable manifestations leading a spectrum from mild mucocutaneous to devastating, life-threatening illness… Epigenetic modifications mediate the effect of the environment on immunologic responses, eventually leading to an inflammatory, autoimmune, multi-systemic disease characterized by autoantibody production and tissue injury."[7] Since patients with SLE can be prone to infection, ESR and CRP may be used in monitoring inflammation.[1] CVD is a very common inflammatory disorder in the United States. Although serum CRP is a nonspecific inflammatory marker and is not a causative agent of

CVD, serum CRP can be used as a biomarker for CVD.[1,8] ESR is elevated in HL, and an ESR ≥50 is considered as an "early-stage unfavorable factor."[3]

*Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate (ESR)*

Erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) is a common laboratory method used to monitor general inflammation. ESR is used to analyze many different conditions, including RA, SLE, arteritis, PMR.[1,9] The simple Westergren method of ESR consists of measuring the distance a blood sample travels in a tube within one hour. The International Council for Standardization in Hematology (ICSH) established a calibration reference to this method using citrate-diluted samples. Automated ESR methods have been established; however, some of these analyzers use different dilution solutions, such as EDTA, rather than citrate. EDTA is commonly used as an anticoagulant in hematology measurements whereas the use of citrate is less prevalent. Horsti, et al. (2010) compared blood samples from 200 patients using the traditional Westergren method versus an EDTA-based method. Their data has an $R^2$ value of only 0.72 and 55 subjects had a difference of over 30%, clearly indicating that ESR is significantly affected by sample preparation methods.[10] ESR can also be affected by red blood cell morphology, ambient conditions (such as high room temperature or tilting of the ESR tube), anemia, renal disease, obesity, heart failure, and hypofibrinogenemia.[1,11]

Erythrocyte sedimentation rate may be affected by noninflammatory factors, thus reducing its specificity for inflammatory processes. Noninflammatory biological factors and environmental conditions can increase a sample's observed ESR. If the serum sample contains elevated concentrations of ions or charged proteins, an elevated ESR may occur; for example, an increase in positively charged plasma proteins could result in agglutination of erythrocytes within a sample for rapid sedimentation.[12]

The ICSH established a Working Group to investigate the ESR methodology used in laboratories; the findings of this working group were published in 2017. Data from over 6000 laboratories on four different continents was examined. Of the laboratories included in the study, only 28% used the "gold standard" Westergren method exclusively (i.e. the method with the established validation by the ICSH) "while 72% of sites used modified or alternate methods." The data obtained from the new methodologies could deviate from the Westergren method by up to 142% and could differ "from each other of up to 42%." The ICSH released recommendations based up the results of these studies. One such recommendation for labs using the non-Westergren method of ESR is to "consider adding an interpretative comment to every result stating that this result was obtained with an ESR instrument that is not based on the standard Westergren method. The sensitivity and specificity of this method for various disease states may be different from the standard Westergren method."[13]

Besides the Westergren method, other methods have been developed to measure ESR including the Zeta sedimentation ratio, Wintrobe's method, and micro-ESR. In a validation study, Shaikh discussed the use of the Ves-Matic Cube 30 analyzer to address the drawbacks of the Westergren method such as contamination risk, the significant blood volume required, and increased duration of analysis. A strong positive correlation was observed between Westergren and Ves-Matic methods with Spearman's coefficient of 0.97. The study concluded that Ves-Matic Cube 30 analyzer can be used in high workload clinical settings for ESR measurement as the generated results were in concordance with those from the Westergren method.

*C-reactive Protein (CRP)*

C-reactive protein (CRP) was first discovered in the early twentieth century when it was isolated in a co-precipitation reaction with the pneumococcal C polysaccharide. The polysaccharide component bound by CRP later was identified to be phosphocholine. Since then, studies have shown that CRP can bind ligands other than bacterial cell wall components. During an acute inflammatory response, hepatocytes can upregulate CRP synthesis more than 1000-fold. The increase in serum CRP "after tissue injury or infection suggests that it contributes to host defense and that it is part of the innate immune response."[8] Determining CRP concentration and fluctuations in plasma CRP can be useful in monitoring inflammatory response; however, what dictates "normal" CRP levels is of debate since CRP concentrations can vary

considerably between individuals, people groups, and laboratory testing methodology. The units used to denote CRP concentrations also vary between laboratories.[1]

***Clinical Validity and Utility***

In a prospective cohort study, Watson, et al. (2019) compared the diagnostic value of CRP and ESR and evaluated whether measuring two inflammatory markers increases accuracy. For each test, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, and AUC were calculated. A total of 136,961 patients with inflammatory testing were measured, of which 61.2% had a single marker measured and 38.8% had multiple markers measured. CRP and ESR were broadly similar in terms of sensitivity, specificity, PPV, and NPV. However, CRP had the highest overall AUC of 0.682 while the AUC for ESR was 0.589. Adding a second test did little improvement in AUC. When CRP and ESR were both tested for, the AUC increased from 0.682 to 0.688. Overall, the authors conclude that "Testing multiple inflammatory markers simultaneously does not increase ability to rule out disease and should generally be avoided. CRP has marginally superior diagnostic accuracy for infections, and is equivalent for autoimmune conditions and cancers, so should generally be the first-line test."[14] In a cross-sectional study, Sherkatolabbasieh, et al. (2020) investigated platelet count, ESR, and CRP levels in pediatric patients with inflammatory disease. A total of 150 children with diagnosis of infectious and inflammatory diseases were included in the study. Platelet count, ESR, and CRP levels were measured at the time of hospitalization and at discharge. At time of hospitalization, all 150 children had abnormal ESR levels, 73.3% had abnormal CRP levels, and 8% had abnormal platelet levels. At time of discharge, only one patient recovered to normal ESR levels, 88% had normal CRP, and 93.3% had normal platelet count. The Fisher exact test showed a significant relationship between platelet count and CRP levels at the time of discharge ($p < 0.0002$) and admission ($p < 0.007$). No relation between platelet count and ESR was observed at admission and discharge. This study found that there are differences in inflammatory markers between the two sexes. The authors conclude that this study showed significant correlation between CRP and platelet levels in girls and CRP level measurement is useful in treatment follow-up.[15]

Alende-Castro, et al. (2021) studied the use of CRP vs ESR in 1472 patients with no inflammatory conditions. All participants were measured for ESR, CRP and IL-6 concentrations. A total of 74.9% of participants showed normal CRP and ESR values, 4.6% showed high ESR and CRP values, and 13.8% showed high CRP but normal ESR values. Participants with high ESR/CRP values also were of older age, and reported high alcohol consumption, low physical activity, high BMI, and the presence of metabolic syndrome. In those patients who had high CRP but normal ESR, BMI seemed to be the main determinant of CRP concentrations. The authors concluded that "In this general adult population with no overt inflammatory disease, the discordant pattern of high ESR and normal CRP was associated with greater age, whereas the pattern of high CRP and normal ESR was associated with higher BMI."[16]

*Rheumatoid Arthritis*

Both CRP and ESR have been used to monitor RA. Elevated CRP and ESR does correlate to observed radiologic damage in RA. Unlike ESR, CRP can be evaluated in stored serum. This could be advantageous due to the time constraints of ESR testing.[11] A 2009 study by Crowson, et al. (2009) show that the use of both ESR and CRP testing in the case of RA is not warranted. Data from three randomized trials of 1247 RA patients was examined. "Where available, the CRP alone may be preferred for disease activity assessment as a simple, validated, reproducible, non age-dependent test."[17] Since both ESR and CRP have been incorporated into composite scoring for RA, the elimination of one or the other will not hinder the quantitative evaluation of the patient using a composite scoring system such as DAS (Disease Activity Score) or SDAI (Simplified Disease Activity Index). A 2015 Danish study clearly shows that the data obtained in DAS using either ESR or CRP "are interchangeable when assessing RA patients and the two versions of DAS28 are comparable."[18] Although, there have been studies that question the effectiveness of both DAS28-ESR and DAS28-CRP.[19,20] To confound issues, "newer biologic agents that target specific inflammatory cytokines are differentially reflected in the ESR and CRP and may therefore disproportionately deflate the composite score."[21]

Bitik, et al. (2015) researched the use of elevated ESR and CRP levels in distinguishing the definitive diagnosis of a rheumatic disorder from patients with nonspecific inflammation. In their study of 112 patients, 47 had a previously diagnosed rheumatic disorder and 65 had no history of a rheumatism. Of the 65 patients with no history of a rheumatic disorder, 52.3% were diagnosed with a new rheumatic disorder with PMR/GCA comprising 38.2%, while 47.7% had a non-rheumatic diagnosis. Within this latter group, only the "CRP levels were significantly higher in infections when compared with new onset RD (rheumatic disease) or malignancies ($p < 0.05$)."[22] The ESR levels between the three groups were statistically insignificant. This indicates that CRP is more sensitive to acute infections than ESR. The authors state that "although ESR and CRP levels have a very low specificity in differentiating between these conditions, in cases of unusually high levels of CRP (especially above 200), more consideration should be given to infections or malignancies."[22]

*Polymyalgia rheumatica (PMR)*

A 2014 study of 60 different PMR patients compared the efficacy of ESR and CRP in assessing disease activity versus patient-reported outcomes and plasma fibrinogen. In this study, the VASDA (Visual analog scale disease activity) and VASQOL (VAS quality of life), two patient-reported outcome methods, were the most responsive to changes in disease activity. Of the serum biomarkers, fibrinogen, ESR, and CRP, fibrinogen was the most accurate with a correlation coefficient of 1.63 whereas 1.2 and 1.05 were the correlation coefficients of ESR and CRP, respectively. These data suggest that plasma fibrinogen would be a more sensitive measure of PMR disease activity as compared to either ESR or CRP.[23]

*Hodgkin lymphoma (CHL)*

Erythrocyte sedimentation rate is used in determining the algorithm to follow in the treatment of Hodgkin lymphoma (CHL). For example, in stage 1A CHL, a patient with an ESR <50 would follow either the NCCN HODG-3 or HODG-4 algorithm with an initial two to three cycles of ABVD (Adriamycin, bleomycin, vinblastine, dacarbazine) most likely whereas a stage 1A patient with an ESR ≥50 would follow the NCCN HODG-6 algorithm with a possible involved-site radiation therapy (ISRT) initially along with the chemotherapy since an ESR ≥50 is considered an "unfavorable factor."[3]

*Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE)*

C-reactive Protein elevation is associated with a number of inflammatory disorders (including RA), tissue damage (such as after a myocardial infarction), as well as bacterial infections; however, CRP levels in SLE do not mirror disease progression. Even during cases of severe disease phenotypes, CRP levels can be normal to modestly increased. One possible reason is CRP suppression by type I interferons, which are increased in SLE. Another possibility is that low concentrations of wildtype CRP play a role in lupus. "Three lines of investigation have raised the possibility that low plasma levels of CRP may be related to the pathogenesis of SLE: 1) an association between SLE and several CRP genetic polymorphisms, at least one of which is associated with low CRP levels, 2) the possibility that low CRP levels may contribute to defective clearance of autoantigens during apoptosis, and 3) the therapeutic efficacy of CRP in mouse models of SLE."[24] Also, CRP and anti-CRP may form large complexes in patients with SLE, which could also decrease the serum concentrations of free CRP.[25] Patients with SLE usually have elevated ESR, but this elevation may be due to persistent polyclonal hypergammaglobulinemia (increased production of several different immunoglobulins).[25]

*Periprosthetic joint infections (PJI)*

Periprosthetic joint infections (PJI) may benefit from the testing of CRP and ESR. Joint arthroplasties (replacements) are typically performed in response to joint damage or destruction and commonly involve areas such as the hip, knee, or shoulder. Up to two percent of total knee replacements may become infected. Common signs of infection are present in PJI such as joint pain or warmth at the incision site, and microbiological cultures may be performed to confirm the diagnosis. CRP and ESR have been suggested as supportive biomarkers in cases where a definitive diagnosis cannot be

made. CRP and ESR are considered minor clinical diagnostic criteria in some definitions of PJI, but due to the ubiquity of these markers, their levels are usually interpreted cautiously.[26]

Perez-Prieto, et al. (2017) examined the performance of CRP and ESR for PJI diagnosis. A total of 73 patients were included in the study. Preoperative CRP levels were found to be normal in 23 patients, and of those 23 patients, 17 patients also had normal ESR levels. Further, 16 patients with normal CRP levels were found to have "low-virulence" organisms (such as *Propionibacterium acnes* and coagulase-negative staphylococci) present. Overall, the authors found that 23% of the patients included in this study would not have been diagnosed with PJI according to the American Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS) guidelines or the Musculoskeletal Infection Society definition.[27]

Kheir, et al. (2018) evaluated the accuracy of inflammatory markers in diagnosis periprosthetic joint infections (PJI). A total of "549 periprosthetic joint infection cases and 653 aseptic total joint arthroplasty revisions" were reviewed. The sensitivity of ESR to diagnose PJI was 0.85 and 0.88 for CRP. ESR was also elevated in antibiotic-resistant strains of bacteria compared to culture-negative cases. For CRP, gram-negative species had higher levels of CRP than culture-negative cases. Overall, the authors concluded that both ESR and CRP had higher false-negative levels than previously reported.[28]

In a retrospective study, Christopher, et al. (2021) studied the use of ESR/CRP ratio to differentiate acute vs chronic periprosthetic joint infections. A total of 147 patients (81 acute and 66 chronic) were measured for ESR and CRP concentrations. The mean ESR / CRP ratio in acute patients was 0.48 compared to 2.87 in chronic patients. The ideal cutoff value was 0.96 for ESR / CRP to predict a chronic (>0.96) vs. acute (<0.96) PJI. The sensitivity at this value was 0.74 and the specificity was 0.90. The authors conclude that "The ESR / CRP ratio may help determine the duration of PJI in uncertain cases. This metric may give arthroplasty surgeons more confidence in defining the duration of the PJI and therefore aid in treatment selection."[29]

*Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD)*

While the search for the optimal biomarker in IBD continues, the most widely available biomarkers in current clinical practice include serum testing with CRP and ESR.[30,31] CRP is frequently used by primary care clinicians to differentiate between IBD and irritable bowel syndrome (IBS). According to Clough, et al. (2024), "CRP is limited as a biomarker in IBD by its lack of specificity, with its expression upregulated in numerous infective and inflammatory pathologies, thus limiting its usefulness in distinguishing between IBD and other differential diagnoses. Its utility in IBD is largely as an adjunct to clinical and endoscopic findings." However, exclusion of IBD should not be made based solely on a normal CRP but in combination with clinical assessment and other markers with better sensitivity.[30]

## VI. Guidelines and Recommendations

**World Health Organization (WHO)**

On May 16, 2018, the WHO released their first edition of the *Model List of Essential In Vitro Diagnostics* (EDL) "to advance universal health coverage, address health emergencies, and promote healthier populations." This list of in vitro diagnostics (IVD) is to be used as a reference of the essential diagnostic tools for laboratories to complement their Model List of Essential Medicines. With respect to the diagnostic tool "to detect inflammation as an indicator of various conditions," the WHO recommends CRP either in an EIA (enzyme immunoassay) or RDT (rapid diagnostic test) assay format. The specimen type can be venous whole blood, serum, or plasma.

In 2019, the WHO released the *Second WHO Model List of Essential In Vitro Diagnostics.* In a table titled *General IVDs for Use in Clinical Laboratories*, CRP is once again listed. The WHO now recommends CRP in an RDT, latex agglutination assay or immunoassay format.[32]

In 2022, the WHO released *the selection and use of essential in vitro diagnostics*, which included the third WHO model list. The WHO performed an evaluation of utilizing ESR "to detect inflammation as an indicator of various conditions when

C-reactive protein (CRP) is not available." In their table, they recommend using the Westergren assay format with sampling from venous whole blood.[33]

**National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN)**

The NCCN guidelines concerning Hodgkin Lymphoma uses ESR as a diagnostic tool in characterizing the stage/risk classification of Classic Hodgkin Lymphoma (CHL) as well as the primary treatment of the disease. In the diagnosis/workup of Hodgkin Lymphoma in adults (age ≥18 years) (recommendation 2A), they list ESR as "essential" and that ESR should be tested within six months of diagnosis.

In the guidelines concerning follow-up after completion of treatment up to five years, the NCCN (2026) recommends obtaining an interim history and physical "every 3-6 months for 1-2 years, then every 6-12 months until year 3, then annually," as well as laboratory studies, which included a "CBC, platelets, chemistry profile, and ESR if elevated at initial diagnosis" with the same timeline. ESR is also used in determining the dosage of ISRT. "A dose of 20 Gy following ABVD X 2 is sufficient if the patient has non-bulky stage I-IIA disease with an ESR <50 mm/hr, no extralymphatic lesions, and only one or two lymph node regions involved." An ESR ≥50 is considered as an "unfavorable risk factor" for stages I and II Hodgkin Lymphoma along with B symptoms. Please note that the NCCN guidelines concerning Hodgkin Lymphoma do not contain any information concerning the use of CRP as a diagnostic or prognostic tool.[3]

In the NCCN guidelines concerning Castleman Disease, the NCCN recommend regarding diagnostic criteria for idiopathic MCD (Multicentric Castleman Disease), minor diagnostic criteria include elevated CRP (>10 mg/L) or ESR (>15 mm/h) where an "Evaluation of CRP is mandatory and tracking CRP levels is highly recommended, but ESR will be accepted if CRP is not available."[34]

In the NCCN guidelines concerning the T-cell lymphomas, they state that the "evaluation of serologic markers such as rheumatoid factor (RF), antinuclear antibodies (ANA), and erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) is useful in patients with suspected autoimmune disease." The guidelines list CRP as "useful in certain circumstances" during the workup for adult T-cell leukemia/lymphoma, and list CRP under the laboratory evaluations that should be completed. Additionally, the guidelines state that inflammatory markers including CRP should be considered for monitoring patients with secondary hemophagocytic lymphohistiocytosis.[35]

**American Society for Clinical Pathology (ASCP)**

In the Choosing Wisely site of the ABIM Foundation, the ASCP released the recommendation to not "order an erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) to look for inflammation in patients with undiagnosed conditions. Order a C-reactive protein (CRP) to detect acute phase inflammation" due to the higher sensitivity and specificity of CRP for acute phase of inflammation. "In the first 24 hours of a disease process, the CRP will be elevated, while the ESR may be normal. If the source of inflammation is removed, the CRP will return to normal within a day or so, while the ESR will remain elevated for several days until excess fibrinogen is removed from the serum."[36]

**Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists (CSTE)/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)**

In the most recent CSTE/CDC Surveillance Case Definition for Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome, the authors states that "laboratory tests vary in ability to distinguish MIS-C from pediatric COVID-19, Kawasaki disease, and toxic shock syndrome. Among laboratory markers of systemic inflammation, elevation in C-reactive protein (CRP) has been consistently greater in MIS-C patients than in children with COVID-19 and Kawasaki disease."[37] Concluding that, consistent with the most current 2023 CSTE/CDC surveillance case definition, elevated CRP is the preferred and most consistently supported inflammatory marker for establishing MIS-C in children associated with SARS-CoV-2 infection.

**European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR)**

In 2009, the EULAR issued their recommendations concerning the management of large vessel vasculitis, which is comprised of two distinct conditions: GCA and Takayasu arteritis. With a "Level of Evidence 3, Strength of recommendation C", they recommend "monitoring of therapy for large vessel vasculitis should be clinical and supported by measurement of inflammatory markers…. For patients with giant cell arteritis, a relapse is usually associated with a rise in ESR and CRP."[38] In this paper, there is no mention of the frequency of ESR and/or CRP testing.

In the 2018 update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of large vessel vasculitis, the guidelines state that regular follow-up and monitoring of disease activity is recommended in patients with large vessel vasculitis, primarily based on symptoms, clinical findings and ESR/CRP levels. "Visits should include clinical monitoring and measurement of ESR and CRP." These routine follow-up visits could be scheduled every one to three months during the first year and in three to six month intervals afterwards.[39]

In 2013, in *EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging of the joints in the clinical management of rheumatoid arthritis,*[40] they state that "baseline inflammatory disease measured by scintigraphy appears to be associated with radiographic progression. In addition, multiple regression analysis has demonstrated that progression of radiographic joint destruction was primarily predicted by $^{99m}$Tc-IgG scintigraphy; joint swelling, ESR and IgM RF (Rheumatoid Factor) were not predictive. This suggests that scintigraphy may be superior to conventional clinical and laboratory measurements in the prediction of joint destruction." This set of guidelines did not include any mention concerning CRP or the frequency of ESR testing.

In 2015, the EULAR and the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) issued joint recommendations concerning the management of PMR.[41] Within their recommendations, they list assessments that "every case of PMR should have…prior to the prescription of therapy (primary or secondary care)." They include a basic laboratory workup "to exclude mimicking conditions and establish a baseline for monitoring of therapy", and they state that this includes "rheumatoid factor and/or anti-cyclic citrullinated peptide antibodies (ACPA), C-reactive protein and/or erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), blood count, glucose, creatinine, liver function tests, bone profile (including calcium, alkaline phosphatase) and dipstick urinalysis." They do not state a specific preference of either CRP or ESR nor do they state the frequency of testing.

In 2016, the EULAR updated their 2007 recommendations concerning the management of early arthritis.[42] The 2016 updates included the following recommendation: "Monitoring of disease activity should include tender and swollen joint counts, patient and physician global assessments, ESR and CRP, usually by applying a composite measure. Arthritis activity should be assessed at 1-month to 3-month intervals until the treatment target has been reached." The recommendation concerning including both ESR and CRP did not change between the 2016 and 2007 recommendations. Within the discussion of the recommendations, they state, "In every patient with active arthritis, closely monitoring disease activity is now considered of particular importance in the therapeutic strategy to provide a good outcome. . . Monitoring disease activity should be as frequent as the level of disease activity mandates, usually every 1-3 months, then potentially less frequently (such as every 6-12 months) once the treatment target has been achieved. Nevertheless, three changes were proposed to this item…. First, a composite measure was recommended as the method of choice to monitor disease activity; second, a specific time frame for monitoring structural damage was deliberately left out and third, patient-reported outcomes were expanded beyond functional assessments."[42]

In 2018, the EULAR issued *EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging in large vessel vasculitis in clinical practice.*[43] They make no recommendation concerning the preference of ESR or CRP nor do they state the frequency of testing; they do state "in patients with a high clinical suspicion of GCA (>50%), for example, in case of new-onset headache, visual symptoms, jaw claudication and elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) and C reactive protein, a positive ultrasound would result in a post-test probability of >95%." These guidelines were updated in 2023 but still do not make recommendations concerning ESR or CRP.[44]

**European League Against Rheumatism (EULAR) & American College of Rheumatology (ACR)**

In 2025, the EULAR and ACR published "risk stratification criteria for development of rheumatoid arthritis in the risk stage of arthralgia." In the guideline, CRP is listed as a serologic marker for risk stratification. "The clinical and serologic variables in the final criteria were morning stiffness, presence of patient-reported joint swelling, difficulty making a fist, and increased CRP, RF, and [anti-citrullinated peptide antibody] status."[45]

In 2025, the EULAR and ACR published "classification criteria for paediatric chronic nonbacterial osteomyelitis." ESR and CRP are included in the classification criteria, which includes three steps.[2]

> "Step 1, Verify entry criteria (ALL should be present):
>
> 1. Bone pain and/or musculoskeletal functional limitation ≥6 wk
> 2. Age of onset <18 y
> 3. Abnormal findings from radiograph and/or advanced imaging including MRI, CT, bone scintigraphy at nonarthritic bone sites
>
> Step 2, Verify exclusion criteria (NONE should be present):
>
> 1. Confirmatory evidence of mutually exclusive mimicker diseases
> 2. Platelet <100,000/mm3
> 3. Pathological LDH concerning for malignancy
> 4. Complete and sustained clinical and laboratory response to antimicrobial treatment alone
>
> Step 3, Add the scores: Add the highest value from each of the 9 domains."[2]
>
> "The final 9 domains include sites of bone lesions and distribution patterns of these lesions based on imaging, bone biopsy pathological findings, age at the onset of symptoms, coexisting conditions, haemoglobin level, associated fever history, ESR, and CRP."[2]

**American College of Rheumatology (ACR)**

In 2012, ACR released their recommendations concerning the clinical practice of using disease activity measures of RA.[21] The recommend using the Disease Activity Score with 28-joint counts (DAS28), the Clinical Disease Activity Index, the Patient Activity Scale (PAS), the PAS-II, the SDAI, and Routine Assessment of Patient Index Data with three measures. The DAS28 is a composite test that can use either CRP or ESR data. The ACR states that both the CRP or ESR used in the DAS28 have been validated in RA. Of the six activity measures recommended by the ACR, only DAS28 received "excellent" recommendations for all three psychometric properties—reliability, validity, and responsiveness. Within the guidelines, the ACR also issued the scores corresponding to remission, low/minimal, moderate, and high/severe RA for all the disease activity measures, including the DAS28, as well as the mathematical formula using either CRP or ESR data to determine the DAS28. CRP is also used in the SDAI; however, the SDAI is rated as "good" for reliability because they state that "test-retest reliability for composite has not been evaluated" for the SDAI. No mention of frequency of testing is made. They do note that the "inclusion of acute-phase reactants in the DAS28 and SDAI complicates the logistics and timing using these measures in point-of-care clinical decision making. Although these measures have traditionally been used in clinical trials, academic medical centers, and large multispecialty clinics, logistical barriers have likely delayed their widespread adoption in smaller practice settings."[21]

In 2015, the ACR issued guidelines for the treatment of RA. While not specifying a preference of either CRP or ESR in diagnosing or predicting the prognosis of RA, they do state in their "Key provisos and principles" that "functional status assessment using a standardized, validated measure should be performed routinely for RA patients, at least once per year, but more frequently if disease is active." They also state that disease activity be measured using ACR-validated scales,

including the DAS28 and/or SDAI. Moreover, they define RA remission as "a tender joint count, swollen joint count, C-reactive protein level (mg/dl), and patient global assessment of ≤1 each or a Simplified DAS of ≤3.3, 1 of 6 ACR-endorsed disease activity measures." These guidelines were updated in 2021 but do not mention CRP or ESR.[46]

In 2015, the ACR and the Spondylitis Association of America (SAA) issued their joint recommendations concerning the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis (AS) and nonradiographic axial spondyloarthritis.[47] Regarding "the treatment of patients with either active or stable AS…we conditionally recommend regular-interval use and monitoring of the CRP concentrations or erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) over usual care without regular CRP or ESR monitoring." This received a "very low-quality evidence; vote 100% agreement" rating. They do make note that as of the time of publication "no studies addressed the effect of routine monitoring of a disease activity measure" but that "the panel thought that monitoring would be most helpful in patients with active symptoms as a guide to treatment." Testing is not required for every clinic visit. The two organizations reaffirm the same recommendations in their 2019 update.[48]

In 2019, updated recommendations by the RA disease activity measures working group were published by England, et al. (2019) Recommended tests include the Clinical Disease Activity Index (CDAI), the SDAI, the Routine Assessment of Patient Index Data 3 (RAPID3), and the 28-Joint Disease Activity Score (DAS28). As noted above, the DAS28 is a composite test that can use either CRP or ESR data. The ACR states that both the CRP or ESR used in the DAS28 have been validated in RA. Updates to the management of RA were released by the ACR in 2022, but no mention of CRP or ESR were made.[50]

In 2021, the ACR published a guideline to provide evidence-based recommendations and expert guidance for the management of GCA. They present 22 recommendations and two ungraded position statements for GCA and note that all but one of the recommendations are conditional due to very low- to low-quality evidence. They break these recommendations down into categories, including diagnostic testing, medical management, surgical intervention, and clinical/laboratory monitoring. All diagnostic recommendations involve biopsy or imaging- they do not recommend the use of CRP or ESR for diagnosis of GCA. However, they do recommend inflammation marker monitoring as part of clinical/laboratory monitoring. They define clinical monitoring as "assessing for clinical signs and symptoms of active disease, obtaining 4 extremity blood pressures, and obtaining clinical laboratory results, including inflammation marker levels", with inflammation markers further defined as being CRP and ESR:

"Recommendation: For patients with GCA in apparent clinical remission, we strongly recommend long-term clinical monitoring over no clinical monitoring: The optimal frequency and length of monitoring are not well established and depend on factors including the duration of remission, site of involvement, risk of disease progression, whether the patient is receiving immunosuppressive therapy, and reliability of the patient to report new signs or symptoms. Clinical monitoring may include history taking, examinations, and laboratory and imaging studies. This is a strong recommendation given the minimal risks and potential catastrophic outcomes if monitoring is not performed.

Recommendation: For patients with GCA who have an increase in levels of inflammation markers alone, we conditionally recommend clinical observation and monitoring without escalation of immunosuppressive therapy. Increases in levels of inflammation markers such as erythrocyte sedimentation rate and C-reactive protein can be nonspecific (69). Therefore, increasing immunosuppressive therapy is not warranted in the setting of increased levels of inflammation markers in the absence of other signs of disease activity. However, these increased levels may warrant more frequent clinical and/or radiographic assessments for active disease."[51]

**American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP)**

In 2013, the AAFP released *Recognition and Management of Polymyalgia Rheumatica and Giant Cell Arteritis*. For PMR, they note that "a normal ESR is found in 6% to 20% of persons with [PMR], although in those cases C-reactive protein level is elevated. ESR predicts relapse more reliably, but C-reactive protein is more sensitive, and is less affected by age and other factors." For GCA, ESR is elevated in up to 89% of patients, but the sensitivity and specificity increase to 99% and

97%, respectively, if both ESR and CRP are tested. Regardless of using either ESR or CRP testing, the AAFP recommends that either ESR or CRP is tested at each clinic visit for patients with either PMR or GCA.[52]

In 2022, the AAFP released *Polymyalgia Rheumatica and Giant Cell Arteritis: Rapid Evidence Review*. The AAFP provided the following recommendations for PMR:

- "An erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) of more than 30 to 40 mm per hour or elevated C-reactive protein (CRP) levels are present in approximately 90% of patients with PMR."[53]

The AAFP provided the following recommendations for GCA:

- "In patients with newly diagnosed GCA, noninvasive vascular imaging (i.e., magnetic resonance imaging or computed tomography angiography) of the neck, chest, abdomen, and pelvis should be performed to evaluate for large vessel involvement."
- "ESR, CRP, complete blood count, and comprehensive metabolic panel should be obtained at presentation and while monitoring medical management."
- "Marked elevation of ESR (40 to 60 mm per hour) or CRP is present in most cases. Disease severity may be reflected in the degree of ESR elevation."
- "Measurement of interleukin-6 should be considered when the patient does not have increased ESR or CRP but the index of suspicion is high. Interleukin-6 may be elevated in new and recurrent cases of GCA, returning to baseline on remission."
- Long-term monitoring is recommended for patients with GCA who are in clinical remission."[53]

**American College of Radiology (ACR)**

The ACR released their updated guidelines concerning the follow-up of Hodgkin lymphoma in 2014. They state that "limited data are available on the role of routine blood work in detecting relapses." ESR is listed as one of the tests conducted as routine blood work in follow-up of Hodgkin lymphoma. They summarize their findings as the following: "In general a majority of recurrences can be detected initially by history and physical examination rather than by routine imaging studies or blood tests such as ESR, CBC, and chemistry."[54] Four of the five variants they reviewed had ESR tests conducted one to two times per year, and the ACR rated the use of ESR as a 3, 5, 5, and 7 in these four variants where a "3" indicates "usually not appropriate," a "5" is "may be appropriate", and a "7" falls in the "usually appropriate" category.

**The British Society for Rheumatology (BSR) & British Health Professionals in Rheumatology (BHPR)**

In 2010, BSR and BHPR issued joint guidelines concerning the management of GCA.[55,56] They recommend "early recognition and diagnosis of GCA is paramount. Particular attention should be paid to the predictive features of ischaemic neuro-ophthalmic complications." As part of this diagnostic recommendation, they specifically list laboratory tests that should be included— "full blood count, urea and electrolytes, liver function tests, CRP, ESR." They note that, although elevated ESR and CRP levels are hallmarks of GCA, "GCA can occur in the face of lower levels of inflammatory markers, if the clinical picture is typical." Another specific recommendation states, "Monitoring of therapy should be clinical and supported by the measurement of inflammatory markers (C; this is a consensus statement)" and that at each visit "full blood count, ESR/CRP, urea and electrolytes, [and] glucose" lab tests be performed.

Also, in 2010, BSR and BHPR issued joint guidelines concerning the management of PMR.[57] For PMR, they recommend initial lab testing for diagnosis to include either ESR and/or CRP prior to initiating long-term steroid therapy. Also, during such therapy, they recommend monitoring either ESR or CRP every three months. This is a portion of the recommendation (B) of "vigilant monitoring of patients for response to treatment and disease activity." In the 2024 update, the guidelines readdress that "the diagnosis of PMR is based on symptoms, signs and laboratory markers with a directed search for other conditions that can mimic PMR" these laboratory markers include acute phase reactants including CRP, ESR and plasma

viscosity. “The evidence base for monitoring and follow-up for people with PMR is lacking. The current recommendations are consensus-based and guided by expert opinion. Some guidelines suggest that follow-up frequency could be as frequent as 1–4 weeks until disease remission, while other guidelines suggest every 1–4 months in the first year of diagnosis.”[58]

**The British Society for Rheumatology (BSR)**

The BSR alone issued their guidelines for the management of SLE in 2018.[25] For the statement “CRP low or normal unless infection,” the BSR gives an overall level of evidence of 2++ with a B grade of recommendation whereas they grade the statement “ESR correlates with active lupus” a 2+ and only a C grade of recommendation. “ESR is often raised in active SLE, but can also reflect persistent polyclonal hypergammaglobulinaemia, and is not a reliable marker of disease activity…. A significantly raised CRP is more likely to indicate infection, and patients with raised CRP will need therefore to be thoroughly screened for infection, given that infection is the commonest cause of death in lupus patients. In contrast, a raised ESR does not discriminate between active lupus and infection.” They recommend that CRP is tested at initial diagnosis and then every one to three months during active disease states. Once stabilized, then testing frequency can be every six to twelve months. They also state that CRP testing should be conducted on mothers with SLE during pregnancy, but they do not state the frequency of the testing during pregnancy. This guideline is currently in revision.

The BSR has also published guidelines on the diagnosis and treatment of GCA. Regarding which evaluations should be performed when starting treatment, the BSR states that “When starting glucocorticoids for suspected GCA, diagnostically relevant symptoms and signs should be documented. Blood should be taken for full blood count, CRP and ESR before or immediately after commencing high-dose glucocorticoids. If GCA is strongly suspected, the first dose of glucocorticoid can be given without waiting for laboratory results.”[59] Further, the BSR provides a list of clinical assessments which should be carried out at or near a GCA diagnosis. These lists include “Measures of activity of GCA: laboratory markers of inflammation (CRP for all patients, plus either ESR or plasma viscosity) and full blood count (platelet count may be elevated in GCA).” Finally, regarding follow-up visits, “Each follow-up visit should include at least a full history, targeted physical examination and measurement of at least a full blood count, ESR and/or CRP, plus follow-up of any abnormalities relevant to the individual patient as well as drug-specific screening for toxicity.”[59] Revision for this guideline will be considered in 2024.

**Canadian Rheumatology Association (CRA)**

The 2012 guidelines by the CRA titled “Canadian Rheumatology Association Recommendations for Pharmacological Management of Rheumatoid Arthritis with Traditional and Biologic Disease-modifying Antirheumatic Drugs” recommends (with Level II and Strength B) “the presence of the following poor prognostic features should be assessed at baseline and considered when making treatment decisions: RF positivity, anti-CCP positivity, functional limitation, high number of swollen and tender joints, early erosions, extraarticular features, high ESR or CRP.” They also recommend (with Level I and Strength A) “RA care providers should monitor disease activity as frequently as every 1 to 3 months in patients with active RA.” The disease activity should be monitored by a validated method, such as DAS28 or SDAI. The most recent updated “living guidelines” for this statement does not include prognostic features or make recommendations for factors included in treatment decisions.[60]

In 2018, CRA released guidelines on assessment and monitoring of SLE. Regarding diagnosis, CRA recommends that best clinical practice includes a complete history and physical examination at baseline with laboratory monitoring which could possibly include (but is not limited to) the following tests: “complete blood count (CBC), liver enzymes, creatine kinase, creatinine and estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR), urine routine/microscopic (urinalysis), urine protein-creatinine ratio, C-reactive protein (CRP), erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR), complements (C3, C4), anti-dsDNA, antinuclear antibodies, antibodies to extractable nuclear antigens, antiphospholipid antibodies (aPL), lupus anticoagulant (LAC), anticardiolipin (aCL), anti-β2-glycoprotein I (anti-β2-GPI), and lipid profile. Follow up laboratory monitoring will depend on

the patient's clinical status and may include CBC, eGFR, urinalysis, urine protein-creatinine ratio, CRP, and/or ESR, C3, C4, and anti-dsDNA antibodies."[61]

**Joint Task Force on Practice Parameters (JTFPP) of the Academy of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology (AAAAI); the American College of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology (ACAAI); and the Joint Council of Allergy, Asthma & Immunology**

The JTFPP within their guidelines concerning the diagnosis and management of acute and chronic urticaria state, "Targeted laboratory testing based on history or physical examination findings is appropriate, and limited laboratory testing can be obtained. Limited laboratory testing includes a CBC with differential, sedimentation rate, and/or C-reactive protein, liver enzyme, and thyroid-stimulating hormone (TSH) measurement… Targeted laboratory testing based on history and/or physical examination (e.g., obtaining TSH in a patient with weight gain, heat/cold intolerance, and thyromegaly) is recommended."[62]

**National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE)**

The NICE first issued the guidelines concerning IBS in 2008 with updates in 2015 and 2017. In individuals who meet the IBS diagnostic criteria, they recommend ESR and CRP along with full blood count and antibody testing for celiac disease or tissue transglutaminase to exclude other possible diagnoses. They do not state anything concerning follow-up testing of either ESR or CRP.[63]

In 2020, NICE reaffirmed a 2018 guideline concerning management of RA. In adults with active RA, they recommend measuring CRP and disease activity monthly in specialist care until remission or low disease activity is achieved.[64]

**American Gastroenterological Association (AGA)**

In a 2019 guideline, the AGA provides recommendations on the use of ESR and CRP in patients presenting with chronic diarrhea:

- "Recommendation 2: In patients presenting with chronic diarrhea, the AGA suggests against the use of erythrocyte sedimentation rate or C-reactive protein to screen for IBD. *Conditional recommendation: low-quality evidence.*"[65]

The AGA notes that while there are "few settings where ESR should be considered as an appropriate screening test for IBD, there are some settings where the use of CRP might be a rational option. For example, if testing for fecal lactoferrin or calprotectin are either not available or not covered by insurance, the use of CRP might be considered to be a reasonable option to screen for IBD."[65]

**American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons (AAOS)**

The AAOS notes that "Strong evidence supports the use of [ESR and CRP] to aid in the preoperative diagnosis of prosthetic joint infection (PJI)." However, the AAOS remarks that neither biomarker is perfectly accurate for PJI diagnosis and should not be used as sole tests for diagnosis. Critically, neither marker informs clinicians of the microbiology of the PJI.

These guidelines were endorsed by IDSA, the ACR, and the Society of Nuclear Medicine and Molecular Imaging.[66]

**Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society and the Infectious Diseases Society of America**

In 2021, a guideline was released on the diagnosis and management of AHO in pediatrics. In children with suspected AHO, they recommend performing a serum CRP on initial evaluation. "Serum CRP has a low accuracy to establish the diagnosis of AHO, but in situations where AHO is confirmed, the serum CRP performed on initial evaluation can serve as the baseline value for sequential monitoring." They recommend against using serum PCT. In terms of ESR, they comment that the ESR is no longer used routinely to diagnose AHO in children. "ESR combined with CRP may slightly improve sensitivity and

negative predictive value for the diagnosis of AHO, but specific thresholds and the overall clinical utility of using both CRP and ESR for diagnostic purposes remain uncertain."[67]

"There are no data to support a particular frequency of CRP monitoring during the course of AHO in children. Measurement every 2 to 3 days during the early therapeutic course, rather than daily, followed by weekly or other periodic measurement until normalization (or a clear trend toward normalization is evident) is an acceptable approach."[67]

**Government of British Columbia**

The government of British Columbia provides practitioner and professional guidelines, including a guideline on CRP and ESR. Within this guideline, they provide key recommendations:

- "CRP is the preferred first test to support a diagnosis of inflammatory or infectious conditions, rather than ESR. There is no indication for ordering ESR when CRP is elevated.
- According to the British Columbia Laboratory Services Outpatient Payment Schedule, ESR will be performed only if a written indication is provided on the requisition. If CRP and ESR are ordered together, most outpatient laboratories will only perform CRP because only CRP is payable.
- Clinical features that together **may** prompt a requisition for CRP are:
  - **unexplained symptoms** or a deterioration of health status; **and**
  - an inflammatory or infectious disease is suspected; **and**
  - a specific diagnosis is not made effectively by other means.
- **Repeat testing for CRP depends on the clinical status of the patient**. It may be used in routine monitoring of patients with inflammatory arthritis and other rheumatic conditions. For most infections, repeat CRP is not indicated and assessment should be made on clinical grounds (e.g., when following treatment of cellulitis,2 pneumonia or urinary tract infections).
- The only indication for CRP assessment in **asymptomatic** individuals is in the stratification of cardiovascular risk. High sensitivity (hs) CRP is one of several tools which may be used in patients at intermediate cardiovascular risk to help decide whether a statin should be started. If hsCRP is desired, it should be specifically requested on the laboratory requisition."[68]

## VII. Applicable State and Federal Regulations

DISCLAIMER: If there is a conflict between this Policy and any relevant, applicable government policy for a particular member [e.g., Local Coverage Determinations (LCDs) or National Coverage Determinations (NCDs) for Medicare and/or state coverage for Medicaid], then the government policy will be used to make the determination. For the most up-to-date Medicare policies and coverage, please visit the Medicare search website: https://www.cms.gov/medicare-coverage-database/search.aspx. For the most up-to-date Medicaid policies and coverage, visit the applicable state Medicaid website.

**Food and Drug Administration**

Many labs have developed specific tests that they must validate and perform in house. These laboratory-developed tests (LDTs) are regulated by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid (CMS) as high-complexity tests under the Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments of 1988 (CLIA '88). LDTs are not approved or cleared by the U. S. Food and Drug Administration; however, FDA clearance or approval is not currently required for clinical use.

Testing of serum acute phase reactants and ESR is performed in laboratories meeting Clinical Laboratory Improvement Act (CLIA) quality standards. The FDA has approved multiple tests for human CRP, including assays for conventional CRP, high-sensitivity CRP (hsCRP), and cardiac CRP (cCRP). On September 22, 2005, the FDA issued guidelines concerning the assessment of CRP.[69] The FDA has approved ESR systems from multiple companies, including the ESR Control -M

Hematology Erythrocyte Sedimentation system (K972172) and the ESR Control -HC Hematology Erythrocyte Sedimentation system (K972170) by R & D Systems, the Seditainer Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate System (K953994) from Becton Dickinson Vacutainer Systems, the Westergren Dispette for ESR (K831195) by Ulster Scientific, and the Dade ESR Kit (K823368) from American Dade.

## VIII. Applicable CPT/HCPCS Procedure Codes

| CPT | Code Description |
|---|---|
| 85651 | Sedimentation rate, erythrocyte; non-automated |
| 85652 | Sedimentation rate, erythrocyte; automated |
| 86140 | C-reactive protein |
| 86141 | C-reactive protein; high sensitivity (hsCRP) |

Current Procedural Terminology© American Medical Association. All Rights reserved.

*Procedure codes appearing in Medical Policy documents are included only as a general reference tool for each policy. They may not be all-inclusive.*

## IX. Evidence-based Scientific References


1. Antonelli M. Acute phase reactants. Updated October 23, 2024. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/acute-phase-reactants
2. Zhao Y, Oliver MS, Schnabel A, et al. EULAR/ACR classification criteria for paediatric chronic nonbacterial osteomyelitis (CNO). *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2025;84(9):1458-1468. doi:10.1016/j.ard.2024.11.006
3. NCCN. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology - Hodgkin Lymphoma Version 1.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/hodgkins.pdf
4. Baker JF. Diagnosis and differential diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis. Updated January 29, 2026. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/diagnosis-and-differential-diagnosis-of-rheumatoid-arthritis
5. Salvarani C, Muratore F. Clinical manifestations and diagnosis of polymyalgia rheumatica. Updated June 4, 2025. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/clinical-manifestations-and-diagnosis-of-polymyalgia-rheumatica
6. Salvarani C, Muratore F. Clinical manifestations of giant cell arteritis. Updated May 14, 2025. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/clinical-manifestations-of-giant-cell-arteritis
7. Gergianaki I, Bertsias G. Systemic Lupus Erythematosus in Primary Care: An Update and Practical Messages for the General Practitioner. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2018;5:161. doi:10.3389/fmed.2018.00161
8. Black S, Kushner I, Samols D. C-reactive Protein. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2004;279(47):48487-90. doi:10.1074/jbc.R400025200
9. Wu AH, Lewandrowski K, Gronowski AM, Grenache DG, Sokoll LJ, Magnani B. Antiquated tests within the clinical pathology laboratory. *The American journal of managed care*. 2010;16(9):e220-7. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/21250398/
10. Horsti J, Rontu R, Collings A. A Comparison Between the StaRRsed Auto-Compact Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate Instrument and the Westergren Method. *Journal of Clinical Medicine Research*. 2010;2(6):261-265. doi:10.4021/jocmr476w
11. Shmerling RH, Greisen SR. Biologic markers in the assessment of rheumatoid arthritis. Updated October 13, 2025. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/biologic-markers-in-the-assessment-of-rheumatoid-arthritis
12. Hale AJ, Ricotta DN, Freed JA. Evaluating the Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate. *Jama*. 2019;321(14):1404-1405. doi:10.1001/jama.2019.1178
13. Kratz A, Plebani M, Peng M, Lee YK, McCafferty R, Machin SJ. ICSH recommendations for modified and alternate methods measuring the erythrocyte sedimentation rate. *International Journal of Laboratory Hematology*. 2017;39(5):448-457. doi:10.1111/ijlh.12693

14. Watson J, Jones HE, Banks J, Whiting P, Salisbury C, Hamilton W. Use of multiple inflammatory marker tests in primary care: using Clinical Practice Research Datalink to evaluate accuracy. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(684):e462-e469. doi:10.3399/bjgp19X704309
15. Sherkatolabbasieh H, Firouzi M, Shafizadeh S. Evaluation of platelet count, erythrocyte sedimentation rate and C-reactive protein levels in paediatric patients with inflammatory and infectious disease. *New Microbes and New Infections*. 2020;37:100725. doi:10.1016/j.nmni.2020.100725
16. Alende-Castro V, Alonso-Sampedro M, Fernández-Merino C, et al. C-Reactive Protein versus Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate: Implications Among Patients with No Known Inflammatory Conditions. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2021;34(5):974-983. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2021.05.210072
17. Crowson CS, Rahman MU, Matteson EL. Which Measure of Inflammation to Use? A Comparison of Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate and C-Reactive Protein Measurements from Randomized Clinical Trials of Golimumab in Rheumatoid Arthritis. 10.3899/jrheum.081188. *The Journal of Rheumatology*. 2009;36(8):1606. doi:10.3899/jrheum.081188
18. Nielung L, Christensen R, Danneskiold-Samsøe B, et al. Validity and Agreement between the 28-Joint Disease Activity Score Based on C-Reactive Protein and Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate in Patients with Rheumatoid Arthritis. *Arthritis*. 2015;2015:401690. doi:10.1155/2015/401690
19. Fransen J, van Riel PL. DAS remission cut points. *Clinical and experimental rheumatology*. 2006;24(6 Suppl 43):S-29-32.
20. Hensor EMA, Emery P, Bingham SJ, Conaghan PG. Discrepancies in categorizing rheumatoid arthritis patients by DAS-28(ESR) and DAS-28(CRP): can they be reduced? *Rheumatology*. 2010;49(8):1521-1529. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keq117
21. Anderson J, Caplan L, Yazdany J, et al. Rheumatoid arthritis disease activity measures: American College of Rheumatology recommendations for use in clinical practice. *Arthritis Care & Research*. 2012;64(5):640-647. doi:10.1002/acr.21649
22. Bitik B, Mercan R, Tufan A, et al. Differential diagnosis of elevated erythrocyte sedimentation rate and C-reactive protein levels: a rheumatology perspective. *European Journal of Rheumatology*. 2015;2(4):131-134. doi:10.5152/eurjrheum.2015.0113
23. McCarthy EM, MacMullan PA, Al-Mudhaffer S, et al. Plasma Fibrinogen Along with Patient-reported Outcome Measures Enhances Management of Polymyalgia Rheumatica: A Prospective Study. 10.3899/jrheum.131055. *The Journal of Rheumatology*. 2014;41(5):931. doi:10.3899/jrheum.131055
24. Gaitonde S, Samols D, Kushner I. C-reactive protein and systemic lupus erythematosus. *Arthritis Care & Research*. 2008;59(12):1814-1820. doi:10.1002/art.24316
25. Gordon C, Amissah-Arthur M-B, Gayed M, et al. The British Society for Rheumatology guideline for the management of systemic lupus erythematosus in adults. *Rheumatology*. 2018;57(1):e1-e45. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kex286
26. Baddour LM, Chen AF. Prosthetic joint infection: Epidemiology, microbiology, clinical manifestations, and diagnosis. Updated March 23, 2026. https://www.uptodate.com/contents/prosthetic-joint-infection-epidemiology-microbiology-clinical-manifestations-and-diagnosis
27. Perez-Prieto D, Portillo ME, Puig-Verdie L, et al. C-reactive protein may misdiagnose prosthetic joint infections, particularly chronic and low-grade infections. *International orthopaedics*. 2017;41(7):1315-1319. doi:10.1007/s00264-017-3430-5
28. Kheir MM, Tan TL, Shohat N, Foltz C, Parvizi J. Routine Diagnostic Tests for Periprosthetic Joint Infection Demonstrate a High False-Negative Rate and Are Influenced by the Infecting Organism. *The Journal of bone and joint surgery American volume*. 2018;100(23):2057-2065. doi:10.2106/jbjs.17.01429
29. Christopher ZK, McQuivey KS, Deckey DG, Haglin J, Spangehl MJ, Bingham JS. Acute or chronic periprosthetic joint infection? Using the ESR/CRP ratio to aid in determining the acuity of periprosthetic joint infections. *J Bone Jt Infect*. 2021;6(6):229-234. doi:10.5194/jbji-6-229-2021
30. Clough J, Colwill M, Poullis A, Pollok R, Patel K, Honap S. Biomarkers in inflammatory bowel disease: a practical guide. *Therapeutic Advances in Gastroenterology*. 2024;17:17562848241251600. doi:10.1177/17562848241251600

31. Muresan S, Slevin M. C-reactive Protein: An Inflammatory Biomarker and a Predictor of Neurodegenerative Disease in Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Disease? *Cureus*. 2024;16(4)doi:10.7759/cureus.59009
32. WHO. Second WHO Model List of Essential In Vitro Diagnostics. https://www.who.int/docs/default-source/nutritionlibrary/complementary-feeding/second-who-model-list-v8-2019.pdf
33. WHO. The selection and use of essential in vitro diagnostics. https://iris.who.int/server/api/core/bitstreams/69fa4fa6-8830-4e00-a6fc-63257b677f65/content
34. NCCN. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology - Castleman Disease Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/castleman.pdf
35. NCCN. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology - T-Cell Lymphomas Version 2.2026. https://www.nccn.org/professionals/physician_gls/pdf/t-cell.pdf
36. ASCP. Thirty Five Things Physicians and Patients Should Question. Updated September 1, 2020. https://ascpcontentwebsite.blob.core.windows.net/content/docs/default-source/istp/cw_35recommendations.pdf
37. Melgar M, Lee EH, Miller AD, et al. Council of State and Territorial Epidemiologists/CDC Surveillance Case Definition for Multisystem Inflammatory Syndrome in Children Associated with SARS-CoV-2 Infection - United States. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. Dec 16 2022;71(4):1-14. doi:10.15585/mmwr.rr7104a1
38. Mukhtyar C, Guillevin L, Cid MC, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of large vessel vasculitis. 10.1136/ard.2008.088351. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2009;68(3):318. doi:10.1136/ard.2008.088351
39. Hellmich B, Agueda A, Monti S, et al. 2018 Update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of large vessel vasculitis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2020;79(1):19-30. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-215672
40. Colebatch AN, Edwards CJ, Østergaard M, et al. EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging of the joints in the clinical management of rheumatoid arthritis. 10.1136/annrheumdis-2012-203158. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2013;72(6):804. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2012-203158
41. Dejaco C, Singh Yogesh P, Perel P, et al. 2015 Recommendations for the Management of Polymyalgia Rheumatica: A European League Against Rheumatism/American College of Rheumatology Collaborative Initiative. *Arthritis & Rheumatology*. 2015;67(10):2569-2580. doi:10.1002/art.39333
42. Combe B, Landewe R, Daien CI, et al. 2016 update of the EULAR recommendations for the management of early arthritis. 10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-210602. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2017;76(6):948. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-210602
43. Dejaco C, Ramiro S, Duftner C, et al. EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging in large vessel vasculitis in clinical practice. 10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-212649. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2018;77(5):636. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-212649
44. Dejaco C, Ramiro S, Bond M, et al. EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging in large vessel vasculitis in clinical practice: 2023 update. *Ann Rheum Dis*. May 15 2024;83(6):741-751. doi:10.1136/ard-2023-224543
45. van Steenbergen HW, Doornkamp F, Alivernini S, et al. EULAR/ACR risk stratification criteria for development of rheumatoid arthritis in the risk stage of arthralgia. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. 2025;84(9):1445-1457. doi:10.1016/j.ard.2025.01.021
46. Fraenkel L, Bathon JM, England BR, et al. 2021 American College of Rheumatology Guideline for the Treatment of Rheumatoid Arthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. Jul 2021;73(7):924-939. doi:10.1002/acr.24596
47. Ward MM, Deodhar A, Akl EA, et al. American College of Rheumatology/Spondylitis Association of America/Spondyloarthritis Research and Treatment Network 2015 Recommendations for the Treatment of Ankylosing Spondylitis and Nonradiographic Axial Spondyloarthritis. *Arthritis & rheumatology (Hoboken, NJ)*. 2016;68(2):282-298. doi:10.1002/art.39298
48. Ward MM, Deodhar A, Gensler LS, et al. 2019 Update of the American College of Rheumatology/Spondylitis Association of America/Spondyloarthritis Research and Treatment Network Recommendations for the Treatment of Ankylosing Spondylitis and Nonradiographic Axial Spondyloarthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2019;71(10):1285-1299. doi:10.1002/acr.24025

49. England BR, Tiong BK, Bergman MJ, et al. 2019 Update of the American College of Rheumatology Recommended Rheumatoid Arthritis Disease Activity Measures. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2019;71(12):1540-1555. doi:10.1002/acr.24042
50. Arnold MJ. Management of Rheumatoid Arthritis: Update From ACR. https://www.aafp.org/afp/2022/0900/practice-guidelines-rheumatoid-arthritis.pdf
51. Maz M, Chung SA, Abril A, et al. 2021 American College of Rheumatology/Vasculitis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Giant Cell Arteritis and Takayasu Arteritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2021;73(8):1349-1365. doi:10.1002/art.41774
52. Caylor TL, Perkins A. Recognition and management of polymyalgia rheumatica and giant cell arteritis. *Am Fam Physician*. 2013;88(10):676-84.
53. Raleigh MF, Stoddard J, Darrow HJ. Polymyalgia Rheumatica and Giant Cell Arteritis: Rapid Evidence Review. *Am Fam Physician*. 2022;106(4):420-426.
54. Ha CS, Hodgson DC, Advani R, et al. Follow-up of Hodgkin lymphoma. *American College of Radiology ACR Appropriateness Criteria*. 2014;
55. Dasgupta B, Borg FA, Hassan N, et al. BSR and BHPR guidelines for the management of giant cell arteritis. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 2010;49(8):1594-7. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keq039a
56. Dasgupta B. Concise guidance: diagnosis and management of giant cell arteritis. *Clinical medicine (London, England)*. 2010;10(4):381-6. doi:10.7861/clinmedicine.10-4-381
57. Dasgupta B, Borg FA, Hassan N, et al. BSR and BHPR guidelines for the management of polymyalgia rheumatica. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 2010;49(1):186-90. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kep303a
58. Toyoda T, Armitstead Z, Bhide S, et al. Treatment of polymyalgia rheumatica: British Society for Rheumatology guideline scope. *Rheumatology Advances in Practice*. 2024;8(1)doi:10.1093/rap/rkae002
59. Mackie SL, Dejaco C, Appenzeller S, et al. British Society for Rheumatology guideline on diagnosis and treatment of giant cell arteritis. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 2020;59(3):e1-e23. doi:10.1093/rheumatology/kez672
60. Hazlewood GS, Pardo JP, Barnabe C, et al. Canadian Rheumatology Association living guidelines for the pharmacological management of rheumatoid arthritis with disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs. *The Journal of Rheumatology*. 2022:jrheum.220209. doi:10.3899/jrheum.220209
61. Keeling SO, Alabdurubalnabi Z, Avina-Zubieta A, et al. Canadian Rheumatology Association Recommendations for the Assessment and Monitoring of Systemic Lupus Erythematosus. *J Rheumatol*. 2018;45(10):1426-1439. doi:10.3899/jrheum.171459
62. Bernstein JA, Lang DM, Khan DA, et al. The diagnosis and management of acute and chronic urticaria: 2014 update. *The Journal of allergy and clinical immunology*. 2014;133(5):1270-7. doi:10.1016/j.jaci.2014.02.036
63. NICE. Irritable bowel syndrome in adults: diagnosis and management. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg61/resources/irritable-bowel-syndrome-in-adults-diagnosis-and-management-pdf-975562917829
64. NICE. Rheumatoid arthritis in adults: diagnosis and management. *National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Clinical Guidelines*. 2018. *National Institute for Health and Care Excellence: Guidelines*.
65. Smalley W, Falck-Ytter C, Carrasco-Labra A, Wani S, Lytvyn L, Falck-Ytter Y. AGA Clinical Practice Guidelines on the Laboratory Evaluation of Functional Diarrhea and Diarrhea-Predominant Irritable Bowel Syndrome in Adults (IBS-D). *Gastroenterology*. 2019;157(3):851-854. doi:10.1053/j.gastro.2019.07.004
66. AAOS. Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guideline for Diagnosis and Prevention of Periprosthetic Joint Infections. Updated March 11, 2019. https://www.aaos.org/globalassets/quality-and-practice-resources/pji/pji-clinical-practice-guideline-final-2-17-21.pdf
67. Woods CR, Bradley JS, Chatterjee A, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline by the Pediatric Infectious Diseases Society and the Infectious Diseases Society of America: 2021 Guideline on Diagnosis and Management of Acute Hematogenous Osteomyelitis in Pediatrics. *J Pediatric Infect Dis Soc*. 2021;10(8):801-844. doi:10.1093/jpids/piab027
68. Government of British Columbia. C-Reactive Protein and Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate Testing. Updated December 5, 2018. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/gov/content/health/practitioner-professional-resources/bc-guidelines/esr#seventeen

69. FDA. Review Criteria for Assessment of C-Reactive Protein (CRP), High Sensitivity C-Reactive Protein (hsCRP) and Cardiac C-Reactive Assays. https://www.fda.gov/downloads/medicaldevices/deviceregulationandguidance/guidancedocuments/ucm071017.pdf

## Publication History

| Date | Action/Description |
|---|---|
| 06/16/2026 | Original Documentation; Governance Approved |
| 09/28/2026 | Policy Update; Updated policy background, guidelines, and evidence-based references; Updated notes in the Indications and/or Limitation of Coverage section |
| | |